UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,402	09/28/2006	Alon Cohen	1582/8	6585

44696   7590   08/18/2011
DR. MARK M. FRIEDMAN
Moshe Aviv Tower, 54th Floor, 7 Jabotinsky St.
Ramat Gan, 52520
ISRAEL

EXAMINER
WILLIS, JONATHAN U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2445	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/18/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@friedpat.com
friedpat.uspto@gmail.com
nomi_m@friedpat.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/599,402	COHEN, ALON
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JONATHAN WILLIS	2445	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 April 2011*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *21-48* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *21-48* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 September 2006* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 03/28/2011 has been entered. Claims 21, 35, 36,

and 42 have been amended. Claims 21-48 are pending examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the fourth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> Subject to the [fifth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112], a claim in dependent form shall contain a reference to
> a claim previously set forth and then specify a further limitation of the subject matter claimed. A claim
> in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to
> which it refers.

3.   Claims 22-27 and 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 4th paragraph, as

being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of the

claim upon which it depends, or for failing to include all the limitations of the claim upon

which it depends.

Each of the claims is directed to a specific component of the system, "The

server-side data processing machine" and does not include all the limitations of the

parent claim; therefore failing to include all the limitations of the claim upon which it depends.

Applicant may cancel the claim(s), amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, rewrite the claim(s) in independent form, or present a sufficient showing that the dependent claim(s) complies with the statutory requirements.

4.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5.   Claims 35-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 35 recites "denying, by said data-access engine said data requests unless said data requests have been routed through one of said at least one pseudo server", and Applicant has pointed to Pg. 8, Lines 16 and 19-20 as support for the data-access engine denying data requests, however, the Examiner does not see how the data-access engine implementing "requests" equates to denying requests.

6.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7.   Claims 21-27, 32, 34, 39, 41 and 43-48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8.   Claims 21 and 42 recite the limitation "securely and efficiently fulfilling network

requests," without explaining how the requests are "securely" or "efficiently" fulfilled;

therefore, the claim is indefinite.

        Claims 22-27 and 43-48 also rejected for being dependant upon a rejected claim.

9.   Claims 25, 32, and 46 recite the limitation "said data request", but "data

requests" were previously claimed, and it is unclear to which specific data request "said

data request" is referencing. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in

the claim.

10.   Claims 27 and 48 recite "said server-logic module and said user interface"

fulfilling "logic requests and user interface requests", and it is unclear whether the

server-logic module and the user interface each fulfill both logic requests **and** user

interface requests, or the server-logic module fulfills logic requests and the user

interface fulfills user interface requests.

11.   Claims 34 and 41 recite "said server-logic module and said user interface"

fulfilling "logic requests or user interface requests", and it is unclear whether the server-

logic module and the user interface can fulfill either of the logic requests **and** user

interface requests, or the server-logic module fulfills logic requests and the user

interface fulfills user interface requests.

12.   Claim 35 recites "denying, by said data-access engine said data requests unless

said data requests have been routed through one of said at least one pseudo server",

but the data request as claimed are sent from the client to the pseudo server, and it is

unclear how the data access engine can deny the "said data requests" not sent through

the pseudo server, when all of the said data requests were sent through the pseudo

server.

      Claims 36-41 are also rejected for being dependant upon a rejected claim.

13.   Claims 39 recites "wherein said step of fulfilling", but is unclear whether the step

is referring to the server-logic module fulfilling or the user interface fulfilling or both.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15.   Claims 21-22, 26-29, 33-34, 42-43, and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2001/0042171 A1 to Vermeulen in view of

US 2004/0267965 A1 to Vasudevan et al. (hereinafter referred to as Vasudevan).

16.   In regard claim 21, **Vermeulen** teaches a system comprising:

(a)   a server-side data-processing machine for securely and efficiently fulfilling

network requests (*see Remote Server as a "server-side data processing machine"* **in**

Fig. 1 [14] and *see Remote Server securely fulfilling requests for files by using a Proxy*

Server in a system of a Client, Proxy Server, and the Remote Server providing

requested files to the Client such as "securely and efficiently fulfilling network request",

in [0022-0023]),

the server-side data-processing machine including a data-access engine,

residing in a server memory of server-side data-processing machine (*see Control*

Program in the Remote Server's Memory as a "data-access engine" run by a Processor,

in [0025] Lines 7-8), and:

(b)   at least one pseudo server residing in a secondary memory of a

secondary data-processing machine (*see Control Program as "at least one pseudo*

server" in the Proxy Server's Main Memory as "a secondary memory of a secondary

data-processing machine", **in Fig. 3 [34] and [0026]**),

wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a server-logic module for

fulfilling data requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing

machine (*see the Proxy Server's Control Program including a Sequence of Control*

Instructions such as a "server logic module" that controls data requests from a Client

such as a "data requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-

processing machine, **in Fig. 2 [11] [21] and [0026]**),

wherein the data request from said client-side data-processing machine for data

stored in said data-access engine must be routed through one of said at least one

pseudo server (*see the Client required to communicate through the Proxy Server to*

load files from the Remote Serve such as "said data-access engine must be routed

through one of said at least one pseudo server", **in Fig. 1 [11] [12] [14] and [0022]**),

wherein the functionality of said data access engine related to said data request

from said client-side data-processing machine is confined to data storage and retrieval

(*see the Remote Server's Control Program handling operations used to compute hash*

codes that are used to determine whether a file is stored such as "data storage" on the

Proxy Server, which is used to determine whether to download the requested stored file

such as "retrieval" from the Proxy Server or the Remote server such as "functionality of

said data access engine related to said data request...is confined to data storage and

retrieval", **in [0025]**), but

Vermeulen does not teach

wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a user interface (UI) for fulfilling

queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing

machine as claimed.

However, **Vasudevan** teaches

wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a user interface (UI) for fulfilling

queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing

machine (*see Multi-Device Proxy Server as "at least one pseudo server" that insert's*

Wormholes such as "a user interface" that provides a modified User Interface tailored to

a content requesting Client's device, **in Fig. 1 [104] [112] [120] and [0166]**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the claimed invention to add the feature of a client using a GUI of a proxy server

to fulfill a client's request, as disclosed in **Vasudevan**, into the teachings of

Vermeulen's Proxy Server, since both references are directed toward using a proxy

server to access a remote server, hence, would be considered to be analogous based

on their related fields of endeavor.

One would be motivated to do so because it is well known in the art that thin-

client computers such as PDA's and Mobile Devices are commonly used to access the

internet using proxy servers to intercept data and manipulate the data in order to make

remote data compatible for thick as well as thin clients (**from Vasudevan in [0004]**),

and **Vermeulen** is enhanced by allowing different type of devices to access high

performance types of remote content; thereby increasing the compatibility of the system

(**from Vasudevan in [0004]**).

17.   In regard to claim 22, **Vermeulen-Vasudevan** teaches the server-side data-

processing machine of claim 21,

wherein said data-access engine is located in a first network and at least one of said at least one pseudo one server is located in a second network having said client-side data-processing machine (*see Control Program of the Remote Server connected to the Internet such as a "first network" and the Client and Proxy Server's Control Program connected over an Intranet such as a "second network"*, **from Vermeulen in Fig. 1 [11] [12] [13] [14] and [0022] [0023]**).

18.   In regard to claim 26, **Vermeulen-Vasudevan** teaches the server-side data-processing machine of claim 21,

wherein a local data request from said client-side data-processing machine for data stored in one of said at least one pseudo server can be fulfilled directly by said one of said at least one pseudo server (*see Proxy Server fulfilling File Requests such as a "local data request" when the requested file is in the Proxy Server's cache*, **from Vermeulen in Fig. 2 [21] and [0022]**).

19.   Claim 27 recites similar limitations to limitations already claimed in claim 21, by replacing "data requests" with "logic requests" and "queries or requests" with "user interface requests", and logic requests and users interface requests have not been defined in the Applicant's Specification and are interpreted as being equivalent to the requests in claim 21; therefore, claim 27 is rejected under the same rationale..

20.   Claims 28-29 and 33 recite substantially the same claims as system claims 21-22

and 26 respectively; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

21.   In regard to claim 34, **Vermeulen-Vasudevan** teaches the network system of

claim 28, and **Vermeulen** teaches wherein said server-logic module of each of said at

least one pseudo server is are further configured to directly fulfill a logic request

originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine (*see the*

Proxy Server's Control Program including a Sequence of Control Instructions such as a

"server logic module" that controls data requests from a Client such as a "logic requests

originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine, **in Fig. 2 [11]**

[21] and [0026]), but

        Vermeulen does not teach

        said user interface of each of said at least one pseudo server is are further

configured to directly fulfill a user interface request originating from said client memory

of said client-side data-processing machine as claimed.

        However, **Vasudevan** teaches

        said user interface of each of said at least one pseudo server is are further

configured to directly fulfill a user interface request originating from said client memory

of said client-side data-processing machine (*see Multi-Device Proxy Server as "at least*

one pseudo server" that insert's Wormholes such as "a user interface" that provides a

modified User Interface tailored to a Client's device that requests content through the

Multi-Device Proxy such as a "user interface request", **in Fig. 1 [104] [112] [120] and**

[0166]).

One would be motivated to combine **Vasudevan** with **Vermeulen** for reasoning

set forth above in claim 21.

22.   In regard claim 42, **Vermeulen** teaches a system comprising:

(a)   a server-side data-processing machine for securely and efficiently fulfilling

network requests (*see Remote Server as a "server-side data processing machine"* **in**

Fig. 1 [14] and *see Remote Server securely fulfilling requests for files by using a Proxy*

Server in a system of a Client, Proxy Server, and the Remote Server providing

requested files to the Client such as "securely and efficiently fulfilling network request",

in [0022-0023]),

the server-side data-processing machine including a data-access engine,

residing in a server memory of server-side data-processing machine (*see Control*

Program in the Remote Server's Memory as a "data-access engine" run by a Processor,

in [0025] Lines 7-8), and:

(b)   at least one pseudo server residing in a secondary memory of a

secondary data-processing machine (*see Control Program as "at least one pseudo*

server" in the Proxy Server's Main Memory as "a secondary memory of a secondary

data-processing machine", **in Fig. 3 [34] and [0026]**),

wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a server-logic module for

fulfilling data requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing

machine (*see the Proxy Server's Control Program including a Sequence of Control Instructions such as a "server logic module" that controls data requests from a Client such as a "data requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine,* **in Fig. 2 [11] [21] and [0026]**),

wherein the data request from said client-side data-processing machine for data stored in said data-access engine must be routed through one of said at least one pseudo server (*see the Client required to communicate through the Proxy Server to load files from the Remote Serve such as "said data-access engine must be routed through one of said at least one pseudo server",* **in Fig. 1 [11] [12] [14] and [0022]**),

wherein the functionality of said data access engine related to said data request from said client-side data-processing machine is confined to data storage and retrieval (*see the Remote Server's Control Program handling operations used to compute hash codes that are used to determine whether a file is stored such as "data storage" on the Proxy Server, which is used to determine whether to download the requested stored file such as "retrieval" from the Proxy Server or the Remote server such as "functionality of said data access engine related to said data request...is confined to data storage and retrieval",* **in [0025]**), but

Vermeulen does not teach

wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a server-logic module for fulfilling data requests via <u>a first set of at least one communications protocols</u> from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine; and

wherein the at least one pseudo server communicates with the data access

engine via <u>a second set of at least one communications protocols</u>; and

wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a user interface (UI) for fulfilling

queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing

machine as claimed.

However, **Vasudevan** teaches

wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a server-logic module for

fulfilling data requests via a first set of at least one communications protocols from a

client memory of a client-side data-processing machine (*see Multi-Device Proxy Server*

as "at least one pseudo server" that has a Content Transfer Protocol Proxy such as a

"server-logic module" that fulfills requests from a Rendering Device such as a "client-

side data processing machine," using a plurality of different communication protocols

depending on the Rendering Device such as a" first set of at least one communication

protocols", **in Fig. 8 [112] [120] [536] and [0103 – 0104]**); and

wherein the at least one pseudo server communicates with the data access

engine via a second set of at least one communications protocols (*see the Content*

Transfer Protocol Proxy communicating to and from a Content Server such as a "data

access engine" using a plurality of different communication protocols such as a "second

set of at least one communications protocols", **in [0103-0104]**) *THE CLAIMS DO NOT*

RECITE THE SPECIFICS OF THE PROTOCOLS CONTAINED IN THE SET,

NEITHER DOES THE SPECIFICATION DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN A FIRST AND

SECOND SET OF COMMUNICATIONS PROTOCOLS

wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a user interface (UI) for fulfilling

queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing

machine (*see Multi-Device Proxy Server that inserts Wormholes such as "a user

interface" that provides a modified User Interface tailored to a content requesting

Client's device,* **in Fig. 1 [104] [112] [120] and [0166]**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the claimed invention to add the feature of a client using a GUI of a proxy server

to fulfill a client's request and communicating using different communication protocols,

as disclosed in **Vasudevan**, into the teachings of **Vermeulen's** Proxy Server, since

both references are directed toward using a proxy server to access a remote server,

hence, would be considered to be analogous based on their related fields of endeavor.

One would be motivated to do so because it is well known in the art that thin-

client computers such as PDA's and Mobile Devices are commonly used to access the

internet using proxy servers to intercept data and manipulate the data in order to make

remote data compatible for thick as well as thin clients (**from Vasudevan in [0004]**),

and it would be advantages to use different protocols according to different types of

devices, and **Vermeulen** is enhanced by allowing different type of devices to access

high performance types of remote content; thereby increasing the compatibility of the

system (**from Vasudevan in [0004]**).

23.   Claims 43 and 47-48 recite substantially the same limitations as system claims

22 and 26-27 respectively; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

24.   Claims 23-24, 30-31, and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Vermeulen-Vasudevan in view of US 6,604,143 B1 to Nagar et

al. (hereinafter referred to as Nagar).

25.   In regard to claim 23, **Vermeulen-Vasudevan** teaches the server-side data-

processing machine of claim 22, wherein said data-access engine is configured to

communicate with other client-side data-processing machines via a pseudo server

residing within said first network (*see Several Clients Connected to the Proxy Server*

over the Intranet, **from Vermeulen in [0023]**), but

        Vermeulen-Vasudevan does not teach communication with other client-side

data-processing machines via pseudo servers as claimed.

        However, **Nagar** teaches communication with other client-side data-processing

machines via pseudo servers the data-access engine (*see Server Program*

communicating with Client Computers in an Intranet via a plurality of Proxy Servers, **in**

Fig. 2 [202] [206] [208] [220] [228] [230] and Col. 6, Line 63 – Col. 7, Line 10)

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the claimed invention to add the features of using a plurality of proxy servers to

communicate with clients inside of an intranet network, as disclosed in **Nagar**, into the

teachings of **Vermeulen-Tanabe's** intranet proxy server, since all of the references are

directed toward proxy servers, hence would be considered to be analogous based on

their related fields of endeavor.

One would be motivated to do so because it is well known that in distributed

computer network systems, multiple system components may be used in a larger

system to facilitate larger amount's of requested information in order to reduce the load

on a single system component (**Nagar in Col. 6, Line 63 - Col. 7, Line 10**).

26.   In regard to claim 24, **Vermeulen-Vasudevan** teaches the server-side data-

processing machine of claim 21, but

Vermeulen-Vasudevan does not teach wherein said data-access engine is

configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between said data

access engine and said at least one pseudo server as claimed.

However, **Nagar** teaches said data-access engine is configured to communicate

via a content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at

least one pseudo server (*see Server Program external to the Intranet as a "data access*

engine" that communicates with Client inside the Intranet through a Response Filter

such as a "content-filtering device" between a Proxy Server as a "pseudo server", **in**

Fig. 2 [220], Fig. 3 [315] [320] [325] and Col. 6, Lines 21-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the claimed invention to add the features filtering content between a proxy

server and a remote server, as disclosed in **Nagar**, into the teachings of **Vermeulen-**

Vasudevan, since all of the references are directed toward proxy servers, hence would

be considered to be analogous based on their related fields of endeavor.

One would be motivated to do so because **Nagar** discloses the current problem

with state of the art filtering methods (**Nagar in Col. 1, Lines 41-44**) and discloses the

need for improvement in content filtering (**Nagar in Col. 2, Lines 4-5**), and the

incorporation of **Nagar** into **Vermeulen-Vasudevan** would enhance **Vermeulen-**

Vasudevan by allowing for current modification of filter rules in filtering incoming and

outgoing proxy request data as it is well known that proxies are filtered (**Nagar in Col.**

2, Lines 11-13).

27.   Claims 30-31 are corresponding system claims of apparatus claims 23-24;

therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

28.   Claims 44-45 recite substantially the same limitations as system claims 23-24

respectively; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

29.   Claims 25, 32, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Vermeulen-Vasudevan in view of US 6,356,941 B1 to Cohen.

30.   In regard to claim 25, **Vermeulen-Vasudevan** teaches the server-side data-

processing machine of claim 21, but

        Vermeulen-Vasudevan does not teach wherein said data-access engine is

configured to only fulfill said data request according to restrictions set by a network vault

as claimed.

However, **Cohen** teaches a data-access engine is configured to only fulfill said

data request according to restrictions set by a network vault (*see Server's Software*

Module as a "data-access engine" that fulfills request, and a Network Vault used to set

restrictions of whether a user requesting a transactions has permission, **in Fig. 3 [48] in**

Col. 13, Lines 42-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the claimed invention to combine the feature of restricting the retrieval of the

requested stored data by using "network vaults" as disclosed in **Cohen**, into the

teachings of **Vermeulen-Vasudevan** files storage server, since all of the references are

directed toward a accessing stored data, hence would be considered to be analogous

based on their related fields of endeavor.

One would have been motivated to do so as **Cohen** discloses the problems

associated with proxy servers and filtered communication and discussed the

advantages of using network vaults to increase security (**Cohen in Col. 7, Lines 39-**

50).

31.   Claim 32 is a corresponding system claim of apparatus claim 25; therefore, it is

rejected under the same rationale

32.   Claim 46 recites substantially the same limitations as system claim 25; therefore,

it is rejected under the same rationale.

33.   Claims 35-36 and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Vermeulen in view Vasudevan, in view of US 2002/0099957 A1

to Kramer et al. (hereinafter referred to as Kramer), and further in view of US

2005/0060534 A1 to Marvasti.

34.   Claim 35 is a corresponding method claim of system claim 21, with the additional

limitation of:

        (b)   denying, by said data-access engine said data requests unless said data

requests have been routed through one of said at least one pseudo server, therefore,

the previous limitations are rejected under the same rationale as in claim 21, and

        Vasudevan teaches

        said data-access engine receiving said data requests that have been routed

through one of said at least one pseudo server (*see the Client required to communicate*

through the Proxy Server to load files from the Remote Serve such as "said data-access

engine must be routed through one of said at least one pseudo server", **in Fig. 1 [11]**

[12] [14] and [0022]), but

        Vermeulen-Vasudevan does not teach denying data requests by a data-access

engine unless said data requests have been routed through one of said at least one

pseudo server.

        However, **Kramer** teaches denying data requests unless said data requests have

been routed through one of said at least one pseudo server (*see a Firewall that denies*

requests that are not originated from a Proxy Server such as a "pseudo sever", **in Fig. 3 [311] and [0041]**), but

Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer does not teach denying data requests by a data-access engine as claimed.

However, **Marvasti** teaches

denying data requests by a data-access engine (*see a Firewall used to govern access to a Remote Server running a database such as a "data-access engine", wherein the firewall is on the Remote Server,* **in [0025][0049]**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to block incoming requests intended to be routed through a proxy server that are not routed through a proxy server, as disclosed in **Kramer**, into the teachings of **Vermeulen-Vasudevan's** routing requests through a Proxy Server, and the teachings of denying request's using a firewall by a data providing server, as disclosed in Marvasti, into the teachings **Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer's** firewall, of since all of the reference are requesting data from a remote server, hence would be considered to be analogous based on their related fields of endeavor.

One would be motivated to do combine **Vermeulen** with **Vasudevan** for reasoning set forth above in claim 21, and one would be motivated to combine **Kramer** with **Vermeulen-Vasudevan** because **Vermeulen-Vasudevan 's** system is set up so that all client file requests are to be routed through a proxy, and it should be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that if a system is set to route all requests through a proxy, any request that is not routed through the proxy should be denied, as it

is well known that firewalls are commonly set in place to avoid such unsafe routing

techniques, and one would be motivated to combine **Marvasti** with **Vermeulen-**

Vasudevan-Kramer in order to reduce the amount of hardware components, by placing

a firewall on the remote server, thereby decreasing the cost of the system.

35.   In regard to claim 36 **Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti** teaches the

method of claim 35,

    wherein said data-access engine is located in a first network and at least one of

said at least one pseudo one server is located in a second network having said client-

side data-processing machine (*see Control Program of the Remote Server connected to*

the Internet such as a "first network" and the Client and Proxy Server's Control Program

connected over an Intranet such as a "second network", **from Vermeulen in Fig. 1 [11]**

[12] [13] [14] and [0022] [0023]).

36.   In regard to claim 40, **Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti** teaches the

method of claim 35, the method further comprising the step of:

    (c)   directly fulfilling, by said one of said at least on pseudo server, a local data

request from said client-side data-processing machine for data stored in said one of

said at least one pseudo server. (*see Proxy Server fulfilling File Requests such as a*

"local data request" when the requested file is in the Proxy Server's cache, **from**

Vermeulen in Fig. 2 [21] and [0022]).

37.   In regard to claim 41, **Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti** teaches the

method of claim 35, and **Vermeulen** teaches the method further comprising the step of:

    (c)   directly fulfilling, by said server-logic module of each of said at least one

pseudo server, a logic request originating from said client memory of said client-side

data-processing machine (*see the Proxy Server's Control Program including a*

Sequence of Control Instructions such as a "server logic module" that controls data

requests from a Client such as a "logic requests originating from a client memory of a

client-side data-processing machine, **from Vermeulen in Fig. 2 [11] [21] and [0026]**),

but

    Vermeulen, Kramer, and **Marvasti** do not teach

    directly fulfilling, by said user interface of each of said at least one pseudo server,

a logic request or a user interface request originating from said client memory of said

client-side data-processing machine as claimed.

    However, **Vasudevan** teaches

    said user interface of each of said at least one pseudo server is are further

configured to directly fulfill a user interface request originating from said client memory

of said client-side data-processing machine (*see Multi-Device Proxy Server as "at least*

one pseudo server" that insert's Wormholes such as "a user interface" that provides a

modified User Interface tailored to a Client's device that requests content through the

Multi-Device Proxy such as a "user interface request", **in Fig. 1 [104] [112] [120] and**

[0166]).

One would be motivated to combine **Vasudevan** with **Vermeulen, Kramer,** and

Marvasti because it is well known in the art software logic is commonly modular,

wherein specific logic modules handle specific type of request, and it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use specific types of software logic to

process respective types of requests.

38.   Claims 37-38 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti in view of Nagar.

39.   In regard to claim 37, **Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti** teaches the

method of claim 36,

wherein said data-access engine is configured to communicate with other client-

side data-processing machines via a pseudo server residing within said first network

(*see Several Clients Connected to the Proxy Server over the Intranet,* **from Vermeulen**

in [0023]), but

Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti does not teach communication with

other client-side data-processing machines via pseudo servers as claimed.

However, **Nagar** teaches communication with other client-side data-processing

machines via pseudo servers the data-access engine (*see Server Program*

communicating with Client Computers in an Intranet via a plurality of Proxy Servers, **in**

Fig. 2 [202] [206] [208] [220] [228] [230] and Col. 6, Line 63 – Col. 7, Line 10)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the claimed invention to add the features of using a plurality of proxy servers to

communicate with clients inside of an intranet network, as disclosed in **Nagar**, into the

teachings of **Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti's** intranet proxy server, since

all of the references are directed toward proxy servers, hence would be considered to

be analogous based on their related fields of endeavor.

One would be motivated to do so because it is well known that in distributed

computer network systems, multiple system components may be used in a larger

system to facilitate larger amount's of requested information in order to reduce the load

on a single system component (**Nagar in Col. 6, Line 63 - Col. 7, Line 10**).

40.   In regard to claim 38, **Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti** teaches the

method of claim 35, but

Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti does not teach wherein said data-

access engine is configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed

between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server as claimed.

However, **Nagar** teaches said data-access engine is configured to communicate

via a content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at

least one pseudo server (*see Server Program external to the Intranet as a "data access*

engine" that communicates with Client inside the Intranet through a Response Filter

such as a "content-filtering device" between a Proxy Server as a "pseudo server", **in**

Fig. 2 [220], Fig. 3 [315] [320] [325] and Col. 6, Lines 21-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the claimed invention to add the features filtering content between a proxy

server and a remote server, as disclosed in **Nagar**, into the teachings of **Vermeulen-**

Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti's routing requests through a proxy server, since all of

the references are directed toward proxy servers, hence would be considered to be

analogous based on their related fields of endeavor.

One would be motivated to do so because **Nagar** discloses the current problem

with state of the art filtering methods (**Nagar in Col. 1, Lines 41-44**) and discloses the

need for improvement in content filtering (**Nagar in Col. 2, Lines 4-5**), and the

incorporation of **Nagar** into **Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti** would enhance

Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti by allowing for current modification of filter

rules in filtering incoming and outgoing proxy request data as it is well known that

proxies are filtered (**Nagar in Col. 2, Lines 11-13**).

41.   Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti in view of Cohen.

42.   In regard to claim 39, **Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti** teaches the

method of claim 35, but

Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti wherein said step of fulfilling is further

dependent upon restrictions set by a network vault as claimed.

However, **Cohen** teaches fulfilling is further dependent upon restrictions set by a

network vault (*see Server's Software Module as a "data-access engine" that fulfills*

request, and a Network Vault used to set restrictions of whether a user requesting a

transactions has permission, **in Fig. 3 [48] in Col. 13, Lines 42-47**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the claimed invention to combine the feature of restricting the retrieval of the

requested stored data by using "network vaults" as disclosed in **Cohen**, into the

teachings of **Vermeulen-Vasudevan-Kramer-Marvasti's** files storage server, since all

of the references are directed toward a accessing stored data, hence would be

considered to be analogous based on their related fields of endeavor.

One would have been motivated to do so as **Cohen** discloses the problems

associated with proxy servers and filtered communication and discussed the

advantages of using network vaults to increase security (**Cohen in Col. 7, Lines 39-**

50).

Response to Arguments

43.   In the Remarks Applicant argued in substance that:

(A) **Vermeulen's** Remote Server contains server logic and a data access engine,

which is different than the present invention in which the Server has a data access

engine only for data storage and retrieval, and the server logic is contained in the

Pseudo Server **(Pages 10-11).**

   In response to Argument (A), Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant,

because clearly in **Vermeulen** the Proxy Server is responsible for fulfilling all requests

to the Client, therefore the claimed "server-logic module for fulfilling the requests" must

be in **Vermeulen's** Proxy Server, and the sole functionality of Vermeulen's Remote

Server is to store data, and retrieve the stored data for the Proxy Server, which caches

and provides the stored content to the Client; therefore, the logic of fulfilling the requests

and storing the requests is separated by the Proxy server; thereby increasing the

security of the system (**Vermeulen [0023]**).

   (B)   **Tanabe's** Proxy Server does not separate the code between the server

logic the user interface, and the data access engine, because Tanabe's Proxy Server

runs a user interface of the Server. **(Pages 11-12)**

   In response to Argument (B), Applicant's arguments, have been fully

considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of

Vasudevan.

(C)   Kramer does not teach denying requests by the Data Access Engine, but rather the firewall. **(Pages 13-14)**

In response to Argument (C), Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant, noting first that the Examiner does not agree with Applicants that support is in the specification that the Data Access Engine denies request not routed through the Pseudo Server, because the Specification does not specifically disclose that the Data Access Engine denies request, and implementing the requests does not provide support for denying the requests by the Data Access Engine, and even if the Specification provided support for the Data Access Engine denying requests not routed through the Pseudo Server, it would not be logical for the Data Access Engine to deny request, because the Specification discloses on Pg. 8, Lines 13-16:

> "Method 40 further includes permitting 46 communication between the data access engine 22 and pseudo
> server 28. Communication is in the form of requests from is pseudo server 28 for data from first data
> processing machine 21, preferably from vault 23. Requests are implemented by data access engine 22"

Which would require that all requests from the client must be routed through the Pseudo Server, therefore, any communication between the Pseudo Server and the Data Access Engine are already routed through the Pseudo Server, thereby, making it illogical to deny a request by the Data Access Engine, especially since the claim is directed towards "said data requests" that when referenced back to the first instance of "data

requests" is referring to data already routed through the Pseudo Server (**see Claim 35**

Lines 5-7).

     (D)   **Blewett** does not teach communicating using two sets of communication

protocols. **(Pages 14-15)**

     In response to Argument (D), Applicant's arguments, have been fully

considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of

Vasudevan.

Conclusion

44.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JONATHAN WILLIS whose telephone number is

(571)270-7467. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 A.M. - 6:00 P.M..

     If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JONATHAN WILLIS/
Examiner, Art Unit 2445
8/11/2011

/Joshua Joo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445